

OPINION 1118
 CONSERVATION OF *TRIBOLBINA CARNEGIEI* LATHAM,
 1932 (ARACHNIDA)

RULING.- (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *inflatus* Peach, 1882, as published in the binomen *Eoscorpius inflatus*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Tribolbina* Latham, 1932 (gender, feminine), type-species, by original designation, *Tribolbina carnegiei* Latham, 1932, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2068.

(3) The specific name *carnegiei* Latham, 1932, as published in the binomen *Tribolbina carnegiei* (specific name of type-species of *Tribolbina* Latham, 1932), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2650.

(4) The specific name *inflatus* Peach, 1882, as published in the binomen *Eoscorpius inflatus*, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1043.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 1588

An application for the suppression of *Eoscorpius inflatus* Peach, 1882, was first received from Dr Ian Rolfe (*Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, U.K.*) on 2 January 1963. It was sent to the printer on 31 January 1963 and published on pp. 388–389 of vol. 20 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on 21 October 1963. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to two palaeontological serials. The application was supported by Dr R.B. Wilson (*Geological Survey of Great Britain, Edinburgh Office*), by Dr R.H. Bate (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) and by Dr Carl Hubbs (*University of California*). No adverse comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 23 August 1965 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1965)27 for or against the proposals set out on p. 389 of vol. 20 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. At the close of the voting period on 23 November 1965 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes – twenty-four (24), received in the

following order: China, Holthuis, Vokes, Riley, Simpson, Obruchev, Alvarado, Munroe, Lemche, do Amaral, Tortonese, Stoll, Uchida, Boschma, Mayr, Ride, Forest, Kraus, Binder, Mertens, Jaczewski, Evans, Brinck, Bonnet

Negative Vote — Sabrosky

Voting Paper not returned — Hubbs.

Dr Sabrosky commented: "Even if the vote is favourable, as it probably will be, with the support of several zoologists and objection by none, I respectfully request reconsideration in the light of the following:

"I consulted Dr Gregory Sohn, specialist on Ostracoda for the U.S. Geological Survey, and he has furnished the following data: (1) *Tribolbina* is a small genus, with only two described species, and it is of no economic importance; (2) in the relatively short time since its description in 1932 it has rarely been mentioned, and then often with a question because so little is known about it —

"1934. Merely listed in the bibliography of Paleozoic Ostracoda by Bassler & Kellett (Memoir 1, Geol. Soc. America)

1958. Mere mention in synoptic list of ostracods by Mertens

1960. Listed as a genus *incertae sedis* in the Russian treatise on ostracods

1961. In the Ostracod volume of the American 'Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology' a diagnosis was given, but the genus was not illustrated and it was questionably referred to the Family BEYRICHIDIAE

1962. In the most recent compilation of all genera of Ostracoda, an objective listing ('Ostracod taxonomy' by H.V. Howe, Louisiana University Press), *Tribolbina* was recorded with a question in the family BEYRICHIDIAE

1962. Sohn, in a paper revising certain genera of Ostracoda, referred to *Tribolbina*, but only incidentally.

"This evidence indicates that the name *Tribolbina* is relatively little known and of small importance and minor usage, as well as still uncertain in position. Surely the Commission cannot be in the position of conserving all minor names with trivial amounts of usage. We might as well give up rules altogether.

"Please note that Articles 67j and 70a, cited in paragraph 8 of the application, are not relevant to this case. The type species of *Tribolbina* is *T. carnegiei* Latham, and no question has been raised

of its misidentification."

Dr Rolfe was invited to reply to this comment. He said: "Contrary to what Sohn affirms, it was in fact the aim of my submission to show that the type species of *Tribolbina* had been misidentified. To reiterate this in terms of Art. 70a(i), the nominal species *Eoscorpius inflatus* Peach, 1882 was wrongly named *Tribolbina carnegiei* by Latham in 1932.

"There is no question of invalidating *Tribolbina*, as Sohn apparently wishes to do, nor does the generic name require any special 'conserving' action by the Commission. The issue is to decide whether *E. inflatus* or *T. carnegiei* should be designated as type species of *Tribolbina*, an issue which Sohn disregards.

"Neither the 'size' of a genus, nor its economic importance, nor its lack of certain familial position, nor the minor usage of its name, is relevant to this issue. It may be added that such criteria are not primary considerations in zoological nomenclature, though they may be involved in cases of conflicting usage.

"The placing of *Tribolbina* and *T. carnegiei* on the appropriate Official Lists will not prevent their future synonymy with other ostracod names, should this ever be demonstrated.

"The usage listed by Sohn reinforces the claim for the designation of *T. carnegiei* as the valid name of the type species rather than *E. inflatus*, since the former has clearly been widely published as type species and neither stability nor uniformity of nomenclature would be served by substituting the senior synonym."

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSION

When I came to examine this file, I found a minute by Dr W.E. China (Assistant Secretary at the time the vote was taken) directing that the Opinion be prepared. It is not clear why this was not done at the time.

Dr Sohn seems to have misunderstood the application, which was concerned, not to conserve the generic name, but to settle the valid name of the type species of the genus. Miss Latham gave an unnecessary new name to an ostracod which Peach had described as a scorpion (it is not, of course, claimed that Article 70a applies to Peach's misidentification). Two nominal species are involved, with different names and different types. Dr Rolfe clearly considered that Miss Latham, having formed a taxonomic concept that represented the same entity as Peach's concept, gave it the wrong name. It does not seem to me that this is a misidentification in the terms of Article 70a, which is not intended to deal with subjective junior synonyms established under misunderstandings.

Nevertheless, two considerations have led me to publish the present Opinion. First, Dr Rolfe (who is an acknowledged authority on fossil scorpions at a higher level than he is on fossil ostracods) honestly sought to clarify a confused situation in the group he was revising. Secondly, the massive vote of the Commission must be respected, while the case scarcely merits being reopened.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

carnegiei, *Tribolbina*, Latham, 1932, *Trans. roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, vol. 57: 358-9

inflatus, *Eoscorpius*, Peach, 1882, *Trans. roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, vol. 30: 405-406

Tribolbina Latham, 1932, *Trans. roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, vol. 57: 358.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (65)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1118.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
2 October 1978